IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 26 OF 2006

VIJAY NANALAL SETH, MUMBAI. ....Petitioner

Versus

THE STATE(THROUGH CBI, GOA), ...Respondent
PANAJI GOA.

Mr. Milind S. Gyani, Advocate for the Petitioner.
Mr. Vaz, Special Public Prosecutor for the State.

Coram:- N. A. BRITTO, J.

Date:- 4th October, 2006

P.C.

Heard the learned Counsel on behalf of the petitioner/accused and learned Public Prosecutor on behalf of the respondent.

It appears that the case before the learned J.M.F.C. is pending for Judgment, which could not be pronounced in the absence of the accused. On 29.09.2006, the learned Counsel on behalf of the accused, had made a categorical statement that the accused would remain present before the Trial Court on 16.10.2006 at 2.30 p.m. It is also submitted on behalf of the accused that there are certain applications pending which require to be disposed of by the learned J.M.F.C. I have no doubt that in case any applications are pending, the same would be disposed of by the learned Judge after hearing the parties either before or along with the Judgment at her discretion. With the above observation, nothing else survives in the petition and the same is accordingly disposed of.

Learned Counsel makes a statement that the accused will now appear before the learned J.M.F.C. at 10.30 a.m. on 16.10.2006.

The statement is accepted.

N. A. BRITTO, J.

arp/*